UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/532,402	03/22/2000	Michael A. Kepler	1631077-0031	8303

7590 12/02/2002

Alex L Yip
Kaye Scholer LLP
425 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER	
LY, ANH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/532,402	KEPLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anh Ly	2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 September 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3, 5-8 and 10-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-8 and 10-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *9 and 12* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/17/2002 with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2. Claims 4 and 9 have been cancelled.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-35 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-3, 5-8, and 10-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,374,241 issued to Lamburt et al. (herein Lamburt).

With respect to claim 1, Lamburt discloses searching at least one database for database records responsive to the query (col. 5, lines 18-24); searching an update database associated with the at least one database for an update record responsive to the query (col. 42, lines 50-58); determining whether an indication is made in the update record (col. 39, lines 60-67 and col. 40, lines 1-15); and including in the search output the records responsive to the query except one or more of the database records which correspond to the update record when the indication is made in the update record (see fig. 53, col. 44, lines 15-30 and col. 44, 15-30 and lines 58-63).

Lamburt does not explicitly indicate an indication is made in the update record; however, he teaches determining a subset of one or more existing entries in the existing database and for each existing entry in the subset, updating the associated the match between each existing entry and the update entry is determined (col. 1, lines 58-67). Also Lamburt teaches the operations of modification that is including updates and deletions to the existing database (col. 45, lines 5-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Lamburt such as the techniques for data integration and updates of databases in computer system (col. 1, lines 5-7), modifications operations based on sub-set or data-set, and query engine so

as to obtain a method for providing a search output responsive to a query. Also Lamburt shows a technique which efficiently update the database by using various techniques to determine equivalents of various record entries which should be considered as matching based on each existing entry and the update entry (col. 55-67 and col. 2, lines 1-8) in the searching, accessing and updating databases environment.

With respect to claim 2, Lamburt discloses wherein if the indication is a delete indicator, the update record is also excluded from the search output (col. 44, lines 15-30 and lines 58-63).

With respect to claim 3, Lamburt discloses wherein the indication comprises at least one field configurable to at least one predefined value (col. 66, lines 44-48).

With respect to claim 5, Lamburt identifying one or more update databases associated with the at least one database (col. 12, lines 45-65).

With respect to claim 6, Lamburt discloses maintaining a search-routing database (col. 6, lines 1-45); receiving the query from a user, said query comprised of search request data in a plurality of search request fields of predetermined types (abstract and col. 5, lines 12-23); selecting search request data in at least one of the search fields (col. 17, lines 40-64); searching said search-routing database for one or more database identifiers, based on the selected search request data (col. 29, lines 30-42); and routing the query to the databases identified by said database identifiers and the update databases associated therewith (col. 4, lines 44-67 and col. 6, lines 1-45).

With respect to claim 7, Lamburt discloses a plurality of databases (col. 1, lines 5-12), said databases including database records having database fields (update

entries such as telephone number and zip code: col. 1, lines 55-67); one or more update databases, said update databases including update records having update database fields (update entry: col. 1, lines 55-67); a search engine for searching one or more of the plurality of databases for database records responsive to the query, returning the database records responsive to the query, searching at least one of the update databases associated with the plurality of databases for an update record responsive to the query, and determining whether an indication is made an update database filed of the update record (see fig. 4, query engine, item 862: col. 6, lines 25-35 and col. 20, lines 35-51); and a sorter for generating the responsive records resulting from the search of the databases and the at least one update database, and including in the search output the records responsive to the query except one or more of the database records which correspond to the update record when the indication is made in the update database field of the update record (col. 16, lines 7-24 and col. 33, lines 12-47).

Lamburt does not explicitly indicate a search engine for searching the databases; however, he teaches query engine (in fig. 4, item 862) to retrieve data from the term lists to obtain identifiers (col. 6, lines 25-35). Also Lamburt teaches the operations of modification that is including updates and deletions to the existing database (col. 45, lines 5-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Lamburt such as the techniques for data integration and updates of databases in computer system (col. 1,

lines 5-7), modifications operations based on sub-set or data-set, and query engine so as to obtain a method for providing a search output responsive to a query. Also Lamburt shows a technique which efficiently update the database by using various techniques to determine equivalents of various record entries which should be considered as matching based on each existing entry and the update entry (col. 55-67 and col. 2, lines 1-8) in the searching, accessing and updating databases environment.

With respect to claim 8, Lamburt discloses Lamburt discloses wherein if the indication is a delete indicator, the update record is also excluded from the search output (col. 44, lines 15-30 and lines 58-63).

With respect to claim 10, discloses a search-routing database; an input device for receiving the query from a user, the query comprised of search request data in search request fields of predetermined types and a search router for receiving the query and selecting search request data in at least one of the search fields; wherein the search engines is configured for searching said search-routing database for one or more database identifiers, said one or more database identifiers identifying the one or more of the plurality of databases (col. 6, lines 1-45; abstract and col. 5, lines 12-23; col. 17, lines 40-64; col. 29, lines 30-42; col. 4, lines 44-67 and col. 6, lines 1-45).

With respect to 11, Lamburt discloses a table for identifying the at least one update database associated with the one or more of the plurality of databases (col. 20, lines 1-15).

With respect to claim 12, Lamburt discloses receiving a search request at a receiving server, the receiving server having one or more databases accessible for

searching; searching a routing database to determine whether the search request should be routed to the one or more databases accessible by the receiving server; and if it is determined that the search request should be routed to the one or more databases accessible; routing the search request to the one or more databases accessible; searching the one or more databases of the receiving server; and returning the results of the search (col. 14, lines 45-64; abstract and col. 18, lines 14-60; col. 11, lines 13-31; col. 8, lines 24-42 and col. 17, lines 40-64).

Lamburt does not explicitly indicate a receiving server having one or more databases accessible for searching; however, he teaches server nodes (see item 808-810 in fig. 4) that are responsible for receiving incoming information for servicing requests (col. 6, lines 40-45). Also Lamburt teaches the operations of modification that is including updates and deletions to the existing database (col. 45, lines 5-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Lamburt such as the techniques for data integration and updates of databases in computer system (col. 1, lines 5-7), modifications operations based on sub-set or data-set, and query engine so as to obtain a method for providing a search output responsive to a query. Also Lamburt shows a technique which efficiently update the database by using various techniques to determine equivalents of various record entries which should be considered as matching based on each existing entry and the update entry (col. 55-67 and col. 2, lines 1-8) in the searching, accessing and updating databases environment.

With respect to claim 13, Lamburt discloses wherein the determining includes analyzing the search request to identifying one or more items of routing data (col. 18, lines 14-60).

With respect to claim 14, Lamburt discloses further comprising routing the search request to a second server if it is determined that the analyzing the search request should not be routed to the databases accessible by the receiving server (col. 18, lines 14-60).

With respect to claim 15, Lamburt discloses wherein said second server is remotely located from the receiving server (col. 18, lines 14-60).

With respect to claim 16, Lamburt discloses further comprising routing the search request to an update database having a plurality of records for updating one or more of the databases (col. 18, lines 14-60).

With respect to claim 17, Lamburt discloses further comprising merging the search results returned from the databases with the search results returned from the update database (col. 13, lines 35-53 and col. 30, lines 32-42).

With respect to claim 18, Lamburt discloses further comprising routing the search request to the one or more databases accessible by said second server (col. 18, lines 14-60).

With respect to claim 19, Lamburt discloses further comprising returning the receiving server the results of the search obtained in response to the routing of the search request to the one or more databases accessible by said second server (col. 18, lines 14-60).

Claim 20 is essentially the same as claim 12 except that it is directed to a system for routing search requests rather than a method (col. 14, lines 45-64; abstract and col. 18, lines 14-60; col. 11, lines 13-31; col. 8, lines 24-42 and col. 17, lines 40-64), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 12 hereinabove.

Claim 21 is essentially the same as claim 13 except that it is directed to a system for routing search requests rather than a method (col. 18, lines 14-60), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 13 hereinabove.

Claim 22 is essentially the same as claim 14 except that it is directed to a system for routing search requests rather than a method (col. 18, lines 14-60), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 14 hereinabove.

Claim 23 is essentially the same as claim 15 except that it is directed to a system for routing search requests rather than a method (col. 18, lines 14-80), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 15 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 24, Lamburt discloses wherein the second server routes the search request to one or more databases accessible by the second server (col. 18, lines 14-60).

With respect to claim 25, Lamburt discloses wherein the second server returns the results of the search obtained in response to the routing of the search request to one or more databases accessible by the second server (col. 18, lines 14-60).

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it is directed to a system for routing search requests rather than a method (col. 18, lines 14-60), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 16 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 27, Lamburt discloses wherein the receiving server routes the search results to the update database in addition to one or more databases with the search results returned from update databases (col. 36, lines 14-20).

With respect to claim 28, Lamburt discloses wherein the receiving server merges the search results returned from the one or more databases with the search results returned from update databases (col. 30, lines 32-42 and col. 36, lines 14-20).

With respect to claim 29, Lamburt discloses maintaining a routing database for identifying one or more database to search in response to a search request; receiving the search request; searching the routing database to determine at least one route to one or more databases to search in response to the search request; if the search of the routing database is successful, routing the search request to a database identified by the routing database; and in other instances, routing the search request to a database identified by one or more default routes (col. 14, lines 45-64; abstract and col. 18, lines 14-60; col. 11, lines 13-31; col. 8, lines 24-42 and col. 17, lines 40-64).

Lamburt does not explicitly indicate one or more default routes; however, he teaches server nodes (see item 808-810 in fig. 4) that are routed the request routing and the query is performed producing data query information (col. 7, lines 25-31). Also Lamburt teaches the operations of modification that is including updates and deletions to the existing database (col. 45, lines 5-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Lamburt such as the techniques for data integration and updates of databases in computer system (col. 1,

lines 5-7), modifications operations based on sub-set or data-set, and query engine so as to obtain a method for providing a search output responsive to a query. Also Lamburt shows a technique which efficiently update the database by using various techniques to determine equivalents of various record entries which should be considered as matching based on each existing entry and the update entry (col. 55-67 and col. 2, lines 1-8) in the searching, accessing and updating databases environment.

With respect to claim 30, Lamburt discloses further comprising analyzing the search request to identifying one or more items of routing data (col. 18, lines 14-60).

With respect to claim 31, Lamburt discloses further comprising searching a routing database with the identified one or more items of routing data to identify one or more databases to which the search request should be routed (col. 7, lines 14-59 and col. 18, lines 14-60).

With respect to claim 32, Lamburt discloses wherein the routing databases identifies at least one route to one or more database that are appropriate to search in response to the search request (col. 18, lines 14-60).

With respect to claim 33, Lamburt discloses wherein the search request is routed to a database identified by the one or more default routes if the search request does not include a field that is used for routing (col. 7, lines 14-59 and col. 18, lines 14-60).

With respect to claim 34, Lamburt discloses wherein the search request is routed to a database identified by the one or more default routes if the search request includes a field that is used for routing but the field has an unspecified value (col. 58, lines 35-65).

With respect to claim 35, Lamburt discloses wherein the search request is routed to a database identified by the one or more default routes if the search request includes a field that is used for routing but the data populating the field does not correspond to any entries in the routing databases (col. 7, lines 14-59 and col. 18, lines 14-60).

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (703) 306-4527 or via E-Mail: **ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV**. The examiner can be reached on Monday Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, see the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached on (703) 305-4393.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 746-7238 (after Final Communication)

or: (703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or: (703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, or Customer Service Center, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (receptionist).

Inquiries of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

AL
Nov. 22nd, 2002.

HOSAIN T. ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER